

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
CHARLOTTE DIVISION  
CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:21-CV-343-MOC-DCK**

<b>DALE THOMAS,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b><u>ORDER</u></b>
	)	
<b>HISCOX INC.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendant.</b>	)	
	)	

---

**THIS MATTER IS BEFORE THE COURT** on “Defendant Hiscox Insurance Company’s Motion To Dismiss For Failure To State A Claim” (Document No. 8) filed August 20, 2021. Having carefully considered the motion, the record, and applicable authority, the undersigned will direct that the pending motion to dismiss be denied as moot.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15 applies to the amendment of pleadings and allows a party to amend once as a matter of course within 21 days after serving, or “if the pleading is one to which a responsive pleading is required, 21 days after service of a responsive pleading or 21 days after service of a motion under Rule 12(b), (e), or (f), whichever is earlier.” Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(a)(1). Rule 15 further provides:

**(2) Other Amendments.** In all other cases, a party may amend its pleading only with the opposing party’s written consent or the court’s leave. The court should freely give leave when justice so requires.

Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(a)(2).

## DISCUSSION

Plaintiff Dale Thomas timely-filed an “Amended Complaint For Declaratory Judgment” (Document No. 10) in this action on August 31, 2021.


It is well settled that a timely-filed amended pleading supersedes the original pleading, and that motions directed at superseded pleadings may be denied as moot. Young v. City of Mount Ranier, 238 F.3d 567, 573 (4th Cir. 2001) (“The general rule ... is that an amended pleading supersedes the original pleading, rendering the original pleading of no effect.”); see also, Fawzy v. Wauquiez Boats SNC, 873 F.3d 451, 455 (4th Cir. 2017) (“Because a properly filed amended complaint supersedes the original one and becomes the operative complaint in the case, it renders the original complaint ‘of no effect.’”); Colin v. Marconi Commerce Systems Employees’ Retirement Plan, 335 F.Supp.2d 590, 614 (M.D.N.C. 2004) (“Earlier motions made by Defendants were filed prior to and have been rendered moot by Plaintiffs’ filing of the Second Amended Complaint”); Brown v. Sikora and Associates, Inc., 311 F. App’x 568, 572 (4th Cir. Apr. 16, 2008); and Atlantic Skanska, Inc. v. City of Charlotte, 3:07-CV-266-FDW, 2007 WL 3224985 at \*4 (W.D.N.C. Oct. 30, 2007).

To the extent Defendant contends the Amended Complaint is deficient, this Order is without prejudice to Defendant filing a renewed motion to dismiss the Amended Complaint, as appropriate.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that “Defendant Hiscox Insurance Company’s Motion To Dismiss For Failure To State A Claim” (Document No. 8) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

**SO ORDERED.**

Signed: September 2, 2021

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David C. Keesler  
United States Magistrate Judge  
